



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/358,940	07/22/1999	WHONCHEE LEE	3028.1US-(96	2152

7590 07/31/2002

JOSEPH A WALKOWSKI  
TRASK BRITT & ROSSA PC  
P O BOX 2550  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110

EXAMINER
----------

PEREZ RAMOS, VANESSA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1765

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2002

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/358,940

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Vanessa Perez-Ramos

Art Unit

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4 and 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant et al. (U.S. 5,439,553) in view of Gigante (U.S. 4,372,803) and in further view of Lin (U.S. 6,251,742).

In regard to claims 1-4, 6 and 8-14, Grant discloses an etchant vapor which selectively etches BPSG, comprising an organic acid (col. 3, lines 59-61, col. 4, line 10), which can be acetic acid (col. 3, line 67; col. 4, line 12), and a fluoride-containing solution, including HF (col. 4, lines 23-25).

Grant does not disclose a preferred volumetric ratio of the organic acid to the fluoride containing solution. Furthermore, Grant discloses a vapor rather than a solution, like the claimed invention does.

Grant, however, does disclose that the variation of process parameters such as ratio of components is expected (col. 6, lines 18-21).

Gigante discloses an etchant composition comprising an organic acid and HF in a ratio of 10:1 (col. 4, lines 22-23).

Lin discloses a semiconductor manufacturing process, and further discloses the equivalence between HF etching solutions (liquid) and vapor-phase etchants for layer etching (col. 3, lines 59-60).

Art Unit: 1765

It is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Grant by utilizing the ratio of the organic acid to the fluoride containing solution used by Applicant, as per Gigante, since Grant himself provides a motivation to do so, because the ratio is well known in the art as evidenced by Gigante's disclosure, and, furthermore, because the volumetric ratio is a result-effective variable, and its variation would have been expected from and obvious to one skilled in the art with the purpose of establishing the optimum process conditions. Furthermore, it is the Examiner's position that the use of an etchant solution instead of a vapor-phase etchant would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, if only for experimentation purposes, in view of Lin's disclosure regarding the equivalence of both, and in anticipation of an expected result.

In regard to claims 7 and 15, the use of ammonium fluoride as the fluoride-containing species would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, because its use is common in the art, and because Grant provides the motivation to try different fluoride containing species, as disclosed in col. 4, lines 24-25.

3. The following prior art is considered pertinent to Applicant's claimed invention: U.S. 5654244 to Sakai, U.S. 6335279 to Jung and U.S. 6077742 to Chen, all of which disclose the equivalence between vapor-phase and liquid-phase etchants.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 and 6-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1765


4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vanessa Perez-Ramos whose telephone number is 703-306-5510. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benjamin Utech can be reached on 703-308-3836. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5665.

Vanessa Perez-Ramos  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1765

VPR  
July 24, 2002

  
BENJAMIN L. UTECH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700